



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Law of Expert and Opinion Evidence," which is to-day the most important sub-head of the law of evidence itself. Following the example of Stephen, the author has arranged the subject by rules; but the work is by no means a digest, for the rules are explained and many cases and citations added to each and every one of them. The work before us is the second edition, a noteworthy feature of which is the number of recent cases in which the rules laid down here were followed, a gratifying tribute to the excellence of the volume and the labor of the author.

We note with regret that the case of *Travis v. Brown*, 43 Pa. 12, (1862), is cited as the Pennsylvania law on the subject of comparison by witnesses. The Act of Assembly of May 15, 1895, P. L. 69, allows experts to make comparison of handwritings, overruling *Travis v. Brown*. Aside from this, the only error we have seen in this work of over 600 pages, the work commends itself to every practitioner because of its practical utility.

J. M. D.

STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW. By E. STOCQUART, D. C. L. Brussels: Veuve Ferdinand Larcier. 1900.

To the student of law comparative jurisprudence is always of peculiar interest. Any contribution to that subject is, therefore, to be especially welcomed. There has just appeared a pamphlet of seventy pages, entitled "Studies in Private International Law," which is both interesting to the theoretical and valuable to the practicing lawyer. Dr. Stocquart, who has written much on kindred topics, presents to our consideration three essays. The first on "Domicile" is very short—too short in fact, since clearness has, in a measure, been sacrificed to brevity. It is to be hoped that at some future time Dr. Stocquart will amplify his ideas on this subject. He does, however, make clear the difference between the American and English point of view in reference to personal capacity, as affected by domicile and the point of view held in Civil Law countries, to wit, France, Belgium, Italy, Spain and Germany. The difference is this: that generally speaking, in the latter countries, a person's civil rights and the legal effects of his conduct, are determined by citizenship or allegiance, while under the Common Law the law of the domicile of the person whose rights or conduct is in question, determines that question. A single example will make this clear. "D., an American citizen, and M., a Spanish lady, age 19, without her father's due consent [absolutely necessary in Spain until 20 years of age in females, and 23 in males], are legally married in the United States. The marriage nevertheless is null in Spain, where M., on her return, will be liable to an imprisonment for a period not less than six months and a day, and not exceeding six years."<sup>1</sup>

Bearing this fundamental distinction in mind we are better pre-

<sup>1</sup> "Studies," p. 28.

pared to understand the second essay on "Marriage," which forms the *pièce de résistance* of the pamphlet.

Our author points out the two legal ways of viewing marriage; that is, either as a sacrament and consequently indissoluble, or as a contract simply, to be broken on occasion in conformity with the rules of positive law. He shows how one or the other of these views has prevailed at all times in Europe, according to the predominance of the church or commonwealth in the various nations. At the present day the latter view prevails in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Germany, Hungary, Switzerland and in Austria also, but not, it seems, to its full extent. Only Spain clings to the canon law as enunciated by the Council of Trent, although civil marriages were legalized during the existence in power of the Liberal party from 1870-75. After that time Roman Catholics could only be married according to the rites of the Church of Rome. Civil marriage was, however, preserved for the benefit of those outside that sect. Since this law applies also to the Philippines we can readily understand the state of concubinage so prevalent in that group of islands. The natives being all Roman Catholics could be legally married only by a priest. Being too poor to pay the required fee, usually exorbitant, considering their means, they could not be married at all. The folly of such a policy is self-evident.

Dr. Stocquart treats at length the laws of marriage in the countries above mentioned, and this essay will be found to be of much practical value in case of foreign successions. We cite one case which is fundamental and—we take it—law in all the countries under the Civil Law. "D., . . . a French domiciled citizen, in order to evade the opposition of his father, goes to Italy and marries an Italian woman without publication in France of banns required by . . . [the] Code Napoleon. The Italian Code leaves it to the French law to decide whether such a marriage is valid or invalid."<sup>1</sup>

The third and concluding essay is on the subject of "Divorce in France and Germany."

Passing by our author's discussion of the vexed question of jurisdiction of the French courts in cases of divorce between foreigners, we come to the ever recurring principle in the Civil Law that the laws of a man's nation pursue him everywhere. Dr. Stocquart says on this point, "The *right of* and *causes for* divorce of a foreigner residing in France are ruled by the laws of his own country, and not by the laws of his actual domicile." Farther on we note this statement: "The American doctrine appears to be the following: Jurisdiction to grant divorces is, in all cases, statutory, and no court, though having jurisdiction, can grant the decree of divorce, except for causes provided by the statute under which they act." This is inaccurate as in some states, certainly the Common Law rules as to divorce still exist.

Turning to the German Law under the new Code, we find that divorce can be had only by judgment of a court and for "causes

<sup>1</sup> "Studies," p. 38.

specified by law.”<sup>1</sup> This statement is ambiguous; whether it means that legislative divorces are not valid or that the *lex patriæ* is not to be regarded is uncertain. Probably in view of the supremacy of the legislature in Germany over the courts the latter is meant.

Altogether Dr. Stocquart's pamphlet is interesting and valuable. In spite of the fact that he is writing in a foreign language which differs in idiom so much from his own (presumably French) there are very few *gaucheries* of expression and only one or two real errors which may fairly be attributed to the Belgian printer. It is to be hoped that our author will at some time expand these essays, as the first and third of them are mere skeletons, a fact due no doubt to the “constant pressure of professional duties” of which he speaks in his preface.

E. B. S., Jr.

<sup>1</sup> “Studies,” p. 69.